

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 23-24, and 26 are amended herein and new claim 27 is presented. No new matter is presented and entry of the amended and new claims is requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-26 are pending and under consideration.
Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite a system including ". . . wherein an icon representing data not forming the file information is not connected by a line to another icon . . ." Claims 6, 11, 16, 23-24, and 26 are amended herein in a similar manner.

Support for the amendments is found, for example, in Figs. 6, 8, and 9 and page 11, line 27 to page 12, line 1, page 17, line 23 to page 18, line 4, and page 19, lines 14-30 of the specification. No new matter is presented and entry of the amended claims is requested.

Traverse of rejections

In item 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Aoyama et al. (U.S. Patent 6,301,592). In items 8-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujieda (U.S. PG PUB 2001/0007997) in view of Chartier et al. (U.S. Patent 6,636,211), and further in view of Aoyama.

The Examiner cites the disclosure of Aoyama in Fig. 16 and col. 8, lines 54-60 as teaching "selecting an icon of a version of information; and displaying connectors of unselected icons differently than connectors of the selected icon," as recited by claim 26. (See, for example, Office Action at pages 2-3).

The Examiner further relies on this disclosure of Aoyama as teaching, for example, ". . . by displaying first lines connecting those icons of the displayed icon data that are related based on first generation information and displaying second lines connecting those icons of the displayed icon data that are related based on second generation information," as is recited, for example, in independent claim 1. (See, for example, Office Action, at page 10)

The rejections are traversed.

* * *

To facilitate the Examiner's understanding of features of an exemplary embodiment as recited by the claims, an annotated sheet including a copy of FIGS. 6, 8 and 9 is attached to this response.

In the attached sheet, the identified hatched circles in FIG. 6 represent that "VERSION 1" and "VERSION 2" of the file information "TAMURA1DRW" do not require the data (parts) of the file information "TAMURA2-1" as illustrated in FIG. 8. Further, "VERSION 3" of the file information "TAMURA1DRW" does not require the data (parts) of the file information "TAMURA2" as shown in FIG. 8.

Thus, as illustrated in Fig. 9, the solid line connecting "VERSION 1" of the file information "TAMURA1DRW" does not connect the icon of data (part) of the file information "TAMURA2-1" with another icon. That is, the solid line is illustrated as not showing the blackened circle indicating a connection of the icon of data (part) of the file information "TAMURA2-1".

As another example, as illustrated in Fig. 9, the small dotted line connecting "VERSION 2" of the file information "TAMURA1DRW" does not connect the icon of the data (part) of the file information "TAMURA2-1" to another icon.

As another example, as illustrated in Fig. 9, the hash dot line connecting "VERSION 3" of the file information "TAMURA1DRW" does not connect to the icon of the part of the file information "TAMURA2."

In other words, icons that are not connected by a line are also displayed when displaying the icon data of the file information.

According to an exemplary embodiment, as recited by claim 1, for example, a system facilitates the understanding of relationships of generations of related drawings so as to be understood even when the number of related drawings are large.

* * *

Applicants submit that Aoyama does not teach a method including "... wherein an icon representing a part of data not included in the information is not connected by a connector to another icon," as recited by claim 26.

Further, Applicants submit that Aoyama does not teach nor suggest, among other things, a system including "... wherein an icon representing data not forming the file information is not connected by a line to another icon," as recited by independent claim 1, for example.

By contrast, Aoyama merely teaches:

In FIG. 16, the creation date of constituent elements is used as a reference for placement in the horizontal direction, and versions specified as elements of projects are connected to each other via a line.

(See, for example, Fig. 16 and lines 54-58).

That is, by contrast, Aoyama teaches that all icons are connected by a line. That is, as illustrated by Aoyama, all *arguendo* "icons" are connected. Applicants submit that since Aoyama is directed to a method of relating version information of a manual (book), the method of Aoyama teaches for example, keeping track of versions of all chapters, for example, of C1 to C10.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Aoyama does not teach a system of relating the icons by a line, while not connecting the line to a certain icon, for example.

* * *

Applicants submit that nothing in the teaching of Fujieda or Chartier overcoming the deficiencies in the teaching of Aoyama discussed above.

Thus, features recited by at least independent claim 1 are not taught by even an *arguendo* combination of the art relied on by the Examiner.

* * *

For the same reasons presented above in traversing the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants submit that even an *arguendo* combination of the art of record does not teach all of the features taught by each of independent claims 6, 11, 16, 23, 24 and 26.

* * *

Dependent claims 2, 4-5, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19-22 and 25 inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reason discussed above.

Conclusion

Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-26 allowed.

New Claim

New claim 27 recites features in a different fashion. Claim 27 recites a method of performed by a processor including "connecting with lines only icons forming file information; and displaying those connecting lines representing a selected version of the file information differently other connecting lines."

Support for the new claim is found in Figs. 6, 8, and 9 and page 11, line 27 to page 12, line 1, page 17, line 23 to page 18, line 4, and page 19, lines 14-30 of the specification. No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the new claim are respectfully requested.

These features of claim 27 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 28, 2009

By:

Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501